

Subject: Re: Reply to this message with your WIPP comments

Date: Tue, 06 Nov 2001 13:54:41 GMT

From: stevens@cybermesa.com

To: Steve_Zappe@nmenv.state.nm.us

 ENTERED

Barbara & Raymond Stevens

to Mr. Zappe,

we have not been able to access our own sent mail for Oct. and Nov. so here is a very similar version of the original email sent early am Nov. 2, 2001.

Comments re: visual examination safety proposals

We are strongly opposed to the new proposals. The way we see it, if random sampling is not random it cannot be accurate. To allow the DOE and its contractors the leeway to select the most convenient samples takes away a safeguard to the public and its environment. Regulation of the kinds of materials being stored at WIPP and the all important documentation of these materials should not be compromised.

Worker safety should not be used as an excuse to take away public safeguards. Worker equipment, tools, and procedures can certainly be upgraded. If worker safety is truly the issue then the DOE/contractor has the responsibility to improve procedures, etc. for the workers but not to tamper with public safety issues.

On Mon, 05 Nov 2001 11:33:21 -0700 Steve Zappe wrote:

- > Hi, Barbara -
- >
- > I received your phone message and I just left you one in reply.
- > I'm sure
- > you had my e-mail address correctly entered, but NMED had their

011113



①

> servers
> turned off from Friday AM until Sunday PM. Therefore, it is highly
> likely that anything you might have sent to me was undeliverable.
>
> This was not your fault, and I will accept your comment if you
> wish to
> resubmit it. Please resend it to this address, and also forward to
> me
> one of the Cyber Mesa messages you receive that indicate your
> timely
> submittal to me (i.e., before Friday 5 PM) was undeliverable. That
> is
> all the proof I need to accept your comment.
>
> Thanks again for your interest and input into the WIPP permit
> modification process.
>
> Steve Zappe
> NMED WIPP Project Leader

Subject: Fw: Return receipt

Date: Tue, 06 Nov 2001 17:47:04 GMT

From: stevens@cybermesa.com

To: steve_zappe@nmenv.state.nm.us

0

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Mail Delivery Subsystem <MAILER-DAEMON@mail.cybermesa.com>

Date: Fri, 2 Nov 2001 07:38:20 -0700 (MST)

Subject: Return receipt

The original message was received at Fri, 2 Nov 2001 07:37:04 -0700 (MST)
from www@webmail.cybermesa.com [198.59.109.4]

----- The following addresses had successful delivery notifications

<steve_zappe@nmenv.state.nm.us> (relayed to non-DSN-aware mailer)

----- Transcript of session follows -----

<steve_zappe@nmenv.state.nm.us>... relayed; expect no further notifications

Subject:

Final-Recipient: RFC822; steve_zappe@nmenv.state.nm.us

Action: relayed (to non-DSN-aware mailer)

Status: 2.0.0

Remote-MTA: DNS; smap.nmenv.state.nm.us

Diagnostic-Code: SMTP; 250 <steve_zappe@nmenv.state.nm.us> OK

Last-Attempt-Date: Fri, 2 Nov 2001 07:38:20 -0700 (MST)

Return-Path: <stevens@cybermesa.com>

Received: from webmail.cybermesa.com (www@webmail.cybermesa.com [198.59.109.4])

by mail.cybermesa.com (8.11.6/8.11.6) with ESMTP id fA2Eb4213695

for <steve_zappe@nmenv.state.nm.us>; Fri, 2 Nov 2001 07:37:04 -0700 (MST)

Message-Id: <200111021437.fA2Eb4213695@mail.cybermesa.com>

Content-Type: text/plain

Content-Disposition: inline

Content-Transfer-Encoding: binary

To: steve_zappe@nmenv.state.nm.us

From: stevens@cybermesa.com

(3)

Fw: Return receipt

X-Originating-IP: 162.33.63.60
MIME-Version: 1.0
Reply-To: stevens@cybermesa.com
Date: Fri, 02 Nov 2001 14:30:15 GMT
X-Mailer: EMUmail 4.5
Subject: comments/nov.2,01
X-Webmail-User: stevens@mail.cybermesa.com